FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

WEEKLY ORGAN OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

JANUARY 16, 1915

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
PERIODICAL DIVISION
JAN 21 1915

From N. Y. Tribune, Jan. 14

Democratic Logic

Vol. III January 16, 1915 No. 3

The Suffragist

Weekly Organ of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

1420 F STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Domestic $1.00
Foreign $1.50
Single Copies .....5 cents

Checks, drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer of the Congressional Union

Columbian Printing Co., Inc., Washington
35

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under act of March 8, 1879

News of the Week

In Congress

THE Mondell resolution which was introduced in the House of Representatives on April 7th, 1913, and which was reported from the Judiciary Committee on May 5, 1914, was debated for over six hours on January 12th and voted upon the same day; 174 votes were cast for the amendment, 204 against it, and 46 were recorded as not voting. Of the 46, 12 were paired in favor and 6 paired against. The amendment thus failed by 78 of the necessary two-thirds.

Work was begun in the Senate the following day to secure the passage of the same amendment in that body and Senator Bristow, who introduced the measure in the upper House, stated that he would endeavor to bring the resolution to a vote in the Senate very shortly. The measure was introduced in the Senate on March 20th, 1914, after having failed by 11 of the necessary two-thirds vote on the previous day. It received a favorable report from the Woman Suffrage Committee in the Senate on April 7th, and has been on the calendar of the Senate since that date.

Men's League Protests Against House Action

THE District of Columbia Men's League for Woman Suffrage has called a protest meeting for tonight (Saturday, January 16th) to be held at Typographical Temple, 423 G Street N. W., to voice the dissatisfaction of the League with the action of the House of Representatives last week. Dr. Harvey Wiley, President of the League, Mr. Leavitt Stoddard, Secretary, and Mr. Benton MacKaye, one of the most active members, have organized the meeting. Mr. Charles Edward Russell will be the principal speaker. The meeting has been called in the hope of demonstrating to Congress the strong sentiment which exists among the men of the country on behalf of the national suffrage amendment and to protest particularly against the speech delivered on the floor by Representative Bowdle, of Ohio, and the reception which the House accorded that speech.

The Indianapolis Speech

WIDESPREAD interest has been evoked by the President's position, as outlined in his Indianapolis speech, that he is primarily the leader of a party rather than the leader of the country.

Senator Borah, Republican, dealt with this point at some length in the Senate on January 13th. "Having arrived at the conclusion that the President prefers to be the leader of a party rather than the Chief Magistrate of the whole people," said Senator Borah, "we shall not need to be reminded of that fact again." "I recall to your mind," he continued, "the language which the President addressed to his own followers. * * * It is the most significant statement I think that was ever made in regard to a coordinate branch of the Government since the days of Andrew Johnson. I do not mean to say by that that the spirit which actuated it was the same, but you will search the history of our country in vain to find any such imputation upon a great coordinate branch of the Government as is found in the remarks of the President at Indianapolis. It calls for the serious consideration of every man who is a member of this body. He said:

"'If any group of men should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic team for any purpose or from any motive, theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them.'

"Not for an evil purpose, not for an unwise purpose, but 'for any purpose' or for any reason should any man dare to break the solidarity of the party, his future will be shrouded with 'unenviable notoriety.'

"Mr. President, that is the sole and central principle upon which every corrupt political machine was ever organized or put into existence. If the President had said 'if any man shall for unrighteous or for mere patronage purposes or for any indefensible reason assume to break the solidarity of the Democratic Party,' he would have been upon safe ground; his position would have been unassailable; but, mind you, the language which fell from the lips of the leader of the Democratic Party at Indianapolis was not different from that which the Indiana boss would have issued to the men in Indianapolis, 80 of whom this morning plead guilty to the crime of corruption; it is not different from the language which would be used by Mr. Murphy, of New York, to his satellitish and slavish adherents to follow the dictates of the captain, regardless of what their volition, their conscience, or their judgment might suggest."

Suffrage in New Jersey

A STATE suffrage amendment was introduced into the New Jersey legislature on January 12th by Assemblyman Peacock. The measure is the same as that which passed the legislature last year. If successful in the present legislature, it will be submitted to a referendum of the men voters of the state next September.

Another Woman Senator

GOVERNOR WEST of Oregon has appointed Miss Kathryn Clarke as state senator to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Newmar. Miss Clarke makes the third woman now serving in the country as state senator.

Woman's Movement for Constructive Peace

THE Woman's Peace Conference held in Washington on January 10th resulted in a permanent organization to promote the extension of a peace movement in every state in the Union. It is planned to have a legislative group in Washington to watch pending legislation and further the progress of bills in Congress which are believed to contribute toward permanent peace. It is also hoped to have an organization in each state in the Union with a legislative committee to watch the proceedings in the state legislature. By these means it is hoped that such public sentiment may be aroused that the President will be willing to call a conference of all neutral nations to bring about the termination of the present war and establish a movement for lasting peace. Miss Jane Addams was elected President of the National Association and Mrs. Glendower Evans, chairman of the Finance Committee.

At the mass meeting which closed the convention, a resolution was unanimously adopted calling upon the House of Representatives to pass the pending Mondell Suffrage Amendment.

Settlement of the Teacher-Mother Controversy

THE now famous teacher-mother controversy in New York has been finally disposed of by the decision of the State Commissioner of Education that prospective mothers may have a leave of absence for two years and that it is unlawful to dismiss a teacher on account of motherhood. The Commissioner has insisted upon the reinstatement of all teachers who have been dismissed on the ground that they had young children.

Progress Among Egyptian Women

MANY signs indicate a considerable awakening among the women of Egypt, particularly in the lines of education. The new Sultan, according to the Cairo correspondent of the *London Times*, is giving his support to the movement.

"Female education is what the country greatly needs," he is quoted as saying, "and if I am in some things a Conservative, I am a Liberal in this."

Woman Doctors Recognized by the English War Office

THE English War Office has at last, after most persistent opposition, recognized the service of women doctors and has given official sanction to a Red Cross army hospital conducted entirely by women at Wimereux. Originally this hospital was at Paris, but when the scene of action was transferred to the coast, the larger part of the staff went to Wimereux, and now both hospitals are in operation. They are under the direction of Dr. Louise Garrett-Anderson, a vice-president of the United Suffragists. It is interesting to note that forty years ago her mother, Doctor Garrett-Anderson, fought the great fight that opened the medical profession to women in England. Now her daughter has taken another step towards securing recognition for women's medical work.

The Suffrage Debate in the House of Representatives

By Annie G. Porritt

Press Chairman Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association and Editor of Publishing Company of the National American Woman Suffrage Association

THE beginning of the end—and an end not far distant—was the thought of every Suffragist as she left the House of Representatives last Tuesday evening after the long debate on the Mondell Amendment. The strength of the woman suffrage cause was evident not only in the immense throng of sympathizers in the galleries, among whom the antis were almost completely swamped, but on the floor of the House where few of the members, even among those who voted against the measure, were willing to put themselves on record as opposed to the principle of woman suffrage. The plea of states' rights proved a convenient excuse for the majority of the Democrats who followed the lead of Underwood of Alabama and Henry of Texas in voting "no" on the amendment.

It is curious how keenly conscious the newspapers become of governmental extravagance when the expenditure is on women. The *New York Tribune* exclaimed over the enormous printing bill the country would have to pay for the sixty-six speeches of last Wednesday in the House of Representatives. Women have been taxed equally with men since the beginning of the Republic, and the debate of last Wednesday was the first full debate in the House of Representatives on an amendment to the Constitution which would insure for women that representation should accompany taxation. Women have helped to pay the bills for innumerable debates in which their interest was of the slightest, and the complaint of extravagance seems about on the same level as the complaint that the admission of women as voters would make more expense for registration and printing of ballots.

THE vote and the speeches were a remarkable vindication of the Congressional Union policy. There was obvious anxiety on the part of the Democrats to represent the question as one on which members of the party were divided—on which the party as a whole could not be held to responsibility. On the other hand, there was the definite assertion of the leader of the Democrats, Representative Underwood, that he spoke for his party in opposing the granting of woman suffrage by an amendment to the Constitution and in upholding the right of each state to settle the question for itself. There was also a convincing reply to those who felt that the policy of the Congressional Union in arousing the women of the equal suffrage states to oppose the Democrats would alienate the friends of woman suffrage in the party. These doubters must have been astonished to hear Seldomridge of Colorado, who was defeated by the Congressional Union, speak in favor of the amendment, and to find both Seldomridge and Neeley of Kansas, who also lost his seat through the activity of the Congressional Union, voting among the "ayes."

From the moment one entered the Capitol, about an hour before the opening of the debate, the popularity of the Suffragists and especially of the Congressional Union was perceptible. The elevator man was proudly wearing a purple, white and gold sash, and a number of the men in the men's gallery which formed a buffer state, between Suffragists and antis in the special galleries, allotted to each party by the Speaker, were also wearing the Congressional Union colors for which they had paid full price to the Congressional Union workers.

The Congressional Union occupied a gallery opposite the Speaker's chair. Among the women in this gallery were Madam Rosika Schwimmer of Hungary, Secretary of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance; Mr. and Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence of England; Miss Eliza Lord, formerly Dean of the Western Reserve University; Mrs. Charles Cole of Albany, one of the early pioneers of the suffrage movement; Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Vice President of

REPRESENTATIVE FRANK W. MONDELL
Author of the Resolution

the Virginia State Suffrage Association; Mrs. Joseph Fels, prominent in the Single Tax movement; Mrs. George H. Day, a member of the Executive Committee of the Connecticut Suffrage Association; Mrs. Harriott Stanton Blatch, President of the Woman's Political Union of New York; Mrs. John Winters Brannan, Treasurer of the same association; Mrs. John Jay White, a member of the Advisory Council of the Union; Miss Julia Hurlbut, Vice President of the Woman's Political Union of New Jersey; Mrs. Tiffany Dyer, prominent in the suffrage work of New York; Mrs. Edna S. Latimer, a member of the Executive Committee of the Maryland Just Government League; Miss Margaret Fay Whittemore, Secretary of the Wayne County, Michigan, Suffrage League; Mrs. William Bross Lloyd of Chicago, a member of the Advisory Council of the Union; Mrs. William Kent of California; Mrs. Charles Edward Russell of New York, and Miss Janet Richards, the well-known lecturer. Miss Alice Paul occupied a seat in the front row and gave the closest attention to proceedings all through the long hours of the debate.

In the Speaker's gallery were several members of the Executive Board of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, including Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, Mrs. Antoinette Funk, Miss Caroline Ruutz Rees, and Mrs. Susan Walker FitzGerald.

IN all there were sixty-six speeches made on the floor of the House between 11 A. M., when the session opened, and 9:15 P. M., when the vote on the amendment was announced. The time was equally divided between those favoring and those opposed to the amendment. The most notable speeches in favor were from Representatives Mondell, Hobson, Murdock, and Mann; while the speakers against included Representatives Underwood, Henry and Hughes, who based their opposition on states' rights, and Webb, Chairman of the Judiciary, Heflin of Alabama and Bowdle of Ohio, who spoke in opposition to the principle of woman suffrage. The most astonishing speech, a speech which might well turn the most confirmed anti into a militant Suffragist, was from Bowdle of Ohio. It was a startling surprise to the women in the galleries that an American man, speaking in the presence of hundreds of his country women, could utter such indecent and insulting remarks, and show such a lack of comprehension of the movement. Mr. Bowdle assumed the position of champion of the down-trodden men of America. He defended low wages for girl and women workers. He insulted both the intelligence and morality of the women, and he let loose what he considered pleasantries about the leniency of men jurors and judges to women. He apparently assumed that women generally were favored because when a young and pretty woman commits a crime she can often get off scot-free. He had nothing to say about the lack of justice to the poor and ignorant woman who is not of the adventuress type and who is often treated just as unjustly on the side of unsympathetic severity as the adventuress who would certainly be dealt out a severer measure of justice if she were tried by her peers.

THE men from the equal suffrage states stood steadily for the amendment. They received with equanimity the taunt, which measures truly the power of the ballot in the hands of woman, that being elected by women, they dared not oppose the demand of the women. They answered with the assertion that they were the experts on this question, and their opinion ought to guide the House. They could say from experience how woman suffrage worked, while the opponents could only talk from their imagination of how it would work. The opponents of the states' rights theory took the position that woman suffrage was not a sectional issue, that there was no such difference in civilization between one state and another as to make it right and expedient in one state to grant suffrage to women, and dangerous in another. The enfranchisement of and the granting of full citizenship to half the nation could not be considered a matter with which Congress had no concern. It would be still left to the states to impose any qualifications they pleased, with the exception that to the restrictions of race and color of the Fifteenth Amendment would be added a restriction as regards sex.

The feeling of the Suffragists as they came away from the Capitol was one of elation that the question of their enfranchisement had been seriously taken up by Congress. Every woman except apparently Mrs. Dodge and her colleagues, who seemed to be under the delusion that the vote of 204 to 174 had finally settled the question so far as Congress was concerned, went away fired with the determination to work harder than ever for the national amendment and to allow the two Houses of Congress and the nation at large no rest so long as there remained a single woman in the United States who is debarred from the suffrage on account of sex.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.
SUITS
COATS
J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.
Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York
WRAPS
FURS
BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Donald Hooker, Md., Chairman Finance
Mrs. Mary Beard, N. Y.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Cal.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr., Pa.

Mrs. Harriott Stanton Blatch, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. Winston Churchill, N. H.
Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin, Cal.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.
Mrs. John Dewey, N. Y.
Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon, Md.
Miss Lavinia Dock, N. Y.
Mrs. Abigail Scott Dunniway, Oregon

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Glendower Evans, Mass.
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Gilmore, Cal.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Miss Ada L. James, Wis.
Miss Helen Keller, Mass.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. William Bross Lloyd, Ill.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.

Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Mrs. Mary Hutcheson Page, Mass.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Annie Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. William Prendergast, N. Y.
Mrs. John Rogers, N. Y.
Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelsen, Ore.
Mrs. Mina Van Winkle, N. J.
Mrs. John Jay White, D. C.
Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, Cal.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.

National Headquarters—1420 F Street, Washington, D. C.

COLORS—PURPLE, WHITE AND GOLD

Senate Resolution 130, and House Resolution 1

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE .—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Introduced:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon.
In the House: April 7, 1913, by Representative Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming.

Referred:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, to the Woman Suffrage Committee.
In the House: April 7, 1913, to the Judiciary Committee.

Reported:

In the Senate: June 13, 1913, favorable report.
In the House: May 5, 1914. Reported without recommendation.

Discussed:

In the Senate: July 31, 1913, twenty-two Senators in favor, three opposing.
September 18, 1913, Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, demanded immediate action.
On January 21, 1914, Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, delivered a speech urging the passage of the Amendment.
Made unfinished business, March 2, 1914.
Debated almost continuously from March 2d to March 19th.

Voted Upon:

In the Senate: March 19, 1914, thirty-five Senators in favor, thirty-four opposed, failing by eleven of the necessary two-thirds vote.
In the House: January 12, 1915, 174 in favor, 204 opposed; failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

Reintroduced:

In the Senate: March 20, 1914, by Senator Bristow, of Kansas.

Reported:

In the Senate: April 7, 1914, favorable report

Present Status:

In the Senate: On Calendar of Senate.

The Vote

THE vote on the Mondell resolution was 174 in favor and 204 opposed.

The party line-up was as follows:

For Suffrage

Democrats	86
Republicans	72
Progressive Republicans	4
Progressives	11
Independent	1
	174

Against Suffrage

Democrats	170
Republicans	34
	204

The present classified membership of the House of Representatives is as follows:

*Democrats	282
Republicans	123
Progressive Republicans	4
Progressives	15
Independent	1
Vacancies	10
	435

We find, therefore, voting for the suffrage measure approximately:**

31 per cent of the Democrats.
64 per cent of the Republicans.
100 per cent of the Progressive Republicans.
93 per cent of the Progressives.
100 per cent of the Independent membership.

Had the entire non-Democratic membership of the House of Representatives (including vacancies) added their votes to those of the 86 Democrats who voted for the resolution, making a total affirmative vote of 238 as against the 171 Democrats who cast their votes in opposition to the measure, the vote for the Mondell resolution would still have fallen short by 35 votes of the 273 votes which would have been required to carry it.

The defeat of the measure was accomplished by an overwhelming majority vote of the Democratic Party.

Let the women of the country clearly understand.

*Including the Speaker, who did not vote.

**These figures credit, as voting for the bill, the members who paired in its favor.

The Responsibility of the Democratic Party

NOT only does the vote show in unmistakable terms the responsibility of the Democratic Party for the non-passage of the amendment in the House, but the same fact is clearly evidenced by the attitude of the Democratic leaders during the course of the debate. Said Mr. Underwood, leader of the Democratic Party in the House, in speaking against the amendment:

"I do not speak for myself alone. As the floor leader of the majority of this House, on this occasion I have a right to speak for my party. The Democratic Party has not been silent on this question. It has not attempted to say what should be done in California or in New York or in Alabama. It has not said that the women of any state in the Union should not have the right to exercise the high privilege of the franchise, but it has said that, under our Constitution, our laws, in view of the history of our Republic, that this question must be settled by the individual states and not by the National Government.

"There is no question that is more fundamental in the history of the Democratic Party than that each state in this Union shall govern its own franchise. If you left the question of the right to vote to the entire people of the United States, they have not the information about local affairs, they are not surrounded by all the conditions that would lead to a wise, a safe, and a patriotic solution of the question."

Mr. Henry, as Chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, and Mr. Webb, as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, two of the most influential Democrats in the House, led the opposition to the suffrage amendment. Said Mr. Henry:

"Democratic Representatives have already met in caucus during this Congress and decided by a record vote that this is a state question, and the proposition should be remanded to the respective states for solution and settlement. I assume that gentlemen of my party are now ready for a record vote in this House as in the Democratic caucus, and take the same stand they did when they had it up for consideration in our party deliberations."

The leader of the Republican Party, Mr. Mann, and the leader of the Progresive Party, Mr. Murdock, not only voted for the amendment but each of them spoke in its behalf on the floor of the House.

The States' Rights Argument

THE flimsiness of the "states' rights" opposition to suffrage was amply demonstrated by the vote on the suffrage amendment. Of the 204 votes against the suffrage resolution, 72 were cast by men who had voted *for* the National Prohibition Amendment, and of these men 63 were Democratic adherents of the states' rights doctrine, 58 of them from the South. This point was clearly brought out by Representative Dupré of Louisiana.

"I am looking forward to some future, early happening with interest," he said, in the course of the debate on National Prohibition.

"The same Committee on Rules which 'fathered' this rule, as I understand, has 'mothered' a rule for submission to the House of the question of woman suffrage. Oh, where, oh, where, then, will be my southern brethren who in a mistaken sense of appreciation of the views of their constituencies are about to vote for this measure?

"Mr. Speaker, there will be some somersaulting done here that will make a circus acrobat pale with envy. There will be some ground and lofty tumbling on that proposition. 'Oh, yes, we were in favor of seeing the Government control the liquor traffic in the respective states, but we are against the Government having anything to do with the question of who is to vote in our states.' Yet the underlying principle is the same." * * *

THE DEBATE ON THE NATIONAL AMENDMENT

PROCEEDINGS in the House of Representatives last Tuesday were opened by Representative Henry as Chairman of the Rules Committee, who offered a privileged resolution from the Rules Committee known as House Resolution 703, and reading—

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of H. J. Res. 1. There shall be not exceeding six hours' general debate, to be divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. At the conclusion of such general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final passage, without any intervening motion, except one motion to recommit: *Provided,* That all Members speaking upon the resolution or amendments offered thereto shall have the privilege of extending their remarks in the *Record,* and all Members shall have the right to print remarks for not exceeding five legislative days: *Provided further,* That all debate shall be confined to the subject matter of the resolution.

This rule, after more than an hour's debate, was adopted by a vote of 209 to 37.

In the course of the debate on the rule, speeches were made on behalf of suffrage by Representatives Campbell of Kansas, Rep., Kelly of Pennsylvania, Prog., Hobson of Alabama, Dem., Murdock of Kansas, Prog., Hulings of Pennsylvania, Prog., Lindbergh of Minnesota, Rep., Lafferty of Oregon, Prog., and Mann of Illinois, Rep. Mr. Lenroot of Wisconsin, Rep., spoke in favor of woman suffrage, but against the resolution. Speeches were made against woman suffrage by Representatives Henry of Texas, Dem., Sumners of Texas, Dem., and Underwood of Alabama, Dem.

Following the adoption of the rule the debate began on the amendment itself and the clerk read to the House the resolution as follows:

Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE —.—SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

Speeches were made on behalf of the amendment by Representatives Taylor of Colorado, Dem., Mondell of Wyoming, Rep., Stephens of California, Prog., Bell of California, Prog. Rep., Bryan of Washington, Prog., MacDonald of Michigan, Prog., Sims of Tennessee, Dem., Stevens of New Hampshire, Dem., Kent of California, Ind., Towner of Iowa, Rep., Madden of Illinois, Rep., Borland of Missouri, Dem., Barnhart of Indiana, Dem., Raker of California, Dem., Seldomridge of Colorado, Dem., Cramton of Michigan, Rep., Farr of Pennsylvania, Rep., Hayes of California, Rep., Sinnott of Oregon, Rep., Hayden of Arizona, Dem., Gorman of Illinois, Dem., Keating of Colorado, Dem., Decker of Missouri, Dem., Reilly of Connecticut, Dem., Baker of New Jersey, Dem., Volstead of Minnesota, Rep., Fess of Ohio, Rep., Hobson of Alabama, Dem., Evans of Montana, Dem., Brown of New York, Dem., Bartholdt of Missouri, Rep., and Mann of Illinois, Rep. Mr. Abercrombie of Alabama, Dem., spoke for suffrage but against the amendment.

Speeches were made against the amendment by Representatives Webb of North Carolina, Dem., Dies of Texas, Dem., Stafford of Wisconsin, Rep., Moore of Pennsylvania, Rep., Morgan of Louisiana, Dem., Bartlett of Georgia, Dem., Sisson of Mississippi, Dem., Hughes of Georgia, Dem., Bowdle of Ohio, Dem., Johnson of Kentucky, Dem., Carter of Oklahoma, Dem., Mulkey of Alabama, Dem., Heflin of Alabama, Dem., Tuttle of New Jersey, Dem., Lazaro of Louisiana, Dem., Cline of Indiana, Dem., Fields of Kentucky, Dem., Miller of Minnesota, Rep., and Sabath of Illinois, Dem. Mr. Bailey of Pennsylvania, Dem., spoke for suffrage but against the amendment.

At the close of the time allowed for debate, Representative Cullop of Indiana, Dem., offered an amendment reading as follows:

Amend, in line 4, by striking out the words "the legislatures" and inserting the word "conventions."

In lines 6 and 7, strike out the word "legislatures" and insert the word "conventions."

This amendment was lost by 142 noes to 108 ayes.

Mr. Garrett of Tennessee, then moved to "strike out the enacting clause," whereupon the Speaker said: "The Chair will read the rule."

A motion to strike out enacting words of a bill—

"And, of course, the same thing applies to a joint resolution"—shall have precedence of a motion to amend, and, if carried, shall be considered equivalent to its rejection.

Mr. Henry spoke against this proposed amendment by Mr. Garrett:

"Mr. Speaker," he began, "I realize that the gentleman from Tennessee has the right to make his motion, and I understand his motives, which are worthy; but, for one, I would like to see a clear-cut vote on this proposition. I would like to have a vote yea or nay on the Mondell amendment, and, as far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote 'nay,' and I hope that nothing will occur here today which will give anyone the opportunity to say hereafter that we have evaded this important issue. Our action should not be subject to misconstruction, and, while that rule says that the striking out of the enacting clause is equivalent to a rejection of the amendment, yet I think we ought to walk up fairly and squarely and vote upon the amendment. Therefore, I shall vote against striking out the enacting clause, and if we succeed in voting that motion down, then I shall vote against the Mondell resolution so that there can be no misunderstanding of my attitude."

Mr. Garrett then withdrew his amendment with regard to the enacting clause and the vote was taken upon the Mondell Resolution. 174 voted for the amendment; 204 against; and 46 were registered as not voting. 12 were paired in favor of the amendment and 6 against (a proportion of two to one because of the two-thirds majority necessary).

The amendment was thus lost, failing by 78 of the two-thirds vote required.

Of those against the amendment, 171 were Democrats and 33 Republicans. Of those for the amendment 86 were Democrats and 72 Republicans, 3 Progressive Republicans, 12 Progressives, and one Independent. Of those not voting, 36 were Democrats, 16 Republicans, and 4 Progressives.

THE VOTE

(R indicates Republican; D, Democrat; P, Progressive; PR, Progressive Republican; Ind, Independent.)

Yeas—174.

Adair, *Ind.* .....D
Alexander, *Mo.* .....D
Anderson, *Minn.* .....R
Anthony, *Kans.* .....R
Austin, *Tenn.* .....R
Avis, *W. Va.* .....R
Baker, *N. J.* .....D
Barnhart, *Ind.* .....D
Bathrick, *Ohio* .....D
Bell, *Calif.* .....PR
Borchers, *Ill.* .....D
Borland, *Mo.* .....D
Britten, *Ill.* .....R
Brown, *N. Y.* .....D
Bryan, *Wash.* .....P
Buchanan, *Ill.* .....D
Butler, *Pa.* .....R
Campbell, *Kans.* .....R
Carr, *Pa.* .....D
Casey, *Pa.* .....D
Chandler, *N. Y.* .....P
Church, *Cal.* .....D
Clancy, *N. Y.* .....D
Cline, *Ind.* .....D
Connelly, *Kans.* .....D
Copley, *Ill.* .....PR
Cramton, *Mich.* .....R
Crosser, *Ohio* .....D
Curry, *Calif.* .....R
Davenport, *Okla.* .....D
Decker, *Mo.* .....D
Deitrick, *Mass.* .....D
Dershem, *Pa.* .....D
Dickinson, *Mo.* .....D
Dillon, *S. Dak.* .....R
Doolittle, *Kans.* .....D
Drukker, *N. J.* .....R
Eagan, *N. J.* .....D
Edmonds, *Pa.* .....R
Evans, *Mont.* .....D
Farr, *Pa.* .....R
Fergusson, *N. Mex.* .....D
Ferris, *Okla.* .....D
Fess, *Ohio* .....R
FitzHenry, *Ill.* .....D
Fordney, *Mich.* .....R
Foster, *Ill.* .....D
Fowler, *Ill.* .....D
Francis, *Ohio* .....D
Frear, *Wis.* .....R
French, *Idaho* .....R
Gallagher, *Ill.* .....D
Gallivan, *Mass.* .....D
George, *N. Y.* .....D
Gilmore, *Mass.* .....D
Good, *Iowa* .....R
Gorman, *Ill.* .....D
Graham, *Pa.* .....R
Green, *Iowa* .....R
Griest, *Pa.* .....R
Guernsey, *Me.* .....R
Hamill, *N. J.* .....D
Hamilton, *Mich.* .....R
Hamlin, *Mo.* .....D
Hart, *N. J.* .....D
Haugen, *Iowa* .....R
Hawley, *Oreg.* .....R
Hayden, *Ariz.* .....D
Hayes, *Calif.* .....R
Helgesen, *N. Dak.* .....R
Helvering, *Kans.* .....D
Hensley, *Mo.* .....D
Hill, *Ill.* .....D
Hobson, *Ala.* .....D
Howell, *Utah* .....R
Hughes, *W. Va.* .....R
Hulings, *Pa.* .....P
Humphrey, *Wash.* .....R
Johnson, *Wash.* .....R
Kahn, *Calif.* .....R
Keating, *Colo.* .....D
Keister, *Pa.* .....R
Kelley, *Mich.* .....R
Kelly, *Pa.* .....P
Kent, *Calif.* .....Ind
Kettner, *Calif.* .....D
Kiess, *Pa.* .....R
Kinkaid, *Nebr.* .....R
Kinkead, *N. J.* .....D
Kirkpatrick, *Iowa* .....D
Knowland, J. R., *Cal.* .....R
Lafferty, *Oreg.* .....PR
LaFollette, *Wash.* .....R
Langley, *Ky.* .....R
Lindbergh, *Minn.* .....R
Lloyd, *Mo.* .....D
Logue, *Pa.* .....D
McAndrews, *Ill.* .....D
McGuire, *Okla.* .....D
McKellar, *Tenn.* .....D
McKenzie, *Ill.* .....R
McLaughlin, *Mich.* .....R
MacDonald, *Mich.* .....P
Madden, *Ill.* .....R
Maher, *N. Y.* .....D
Mann, *Ill.* .....R
Mapes, *Mich.* .....R
Martin, *S. Dak.* .....R
Metz, *N. Y.* .....D
Mitchell, *Mass.* .....D
Mondell, *Wyo.* .....R
Morgan, *Okla.* .....R
Moss, *Ind.* .....D
Mott, *N. Y.* .....R
Murdock, *Kans.* .....P
Neeley, *Kans.* .....D
Neely, *W. Va.* .....D
Nelson, *Wis.* .....R
Nolan, J. I., *Calif.* .....P
Norton, *N. Dak.* .....R
O'Hair, *Ill.* .....D
O'Shaunessy, *R. I.* .....D
Palmer, *Pa.* .....D
Patton, *Pa.* .....R
Peterson, *Ind.* .....D
Phelan, *Mass.* .....D
Porter, *Pa.* .....R
Prouty, *Iowa* .....R
Rainey, *Ill.* .....D
Raker, *Calif.* .....D
Reilly, *Conn.* .....D
Roberts, *Mass.* .....R
Rogers, *Mass.* .....R
Rubey, *Mo.* .....D
Rucker, *Mo.* .....D
Rupley, *Pa.* .....P
Russell, *Mo.* .....D
Sabath, *Ill.* .....D
Scully, *N. J.* .....D
Seldomridge, *Colo.* .....D
Sells, *Tenn.* .....R
Shackleford, *Mo.* .....D
Sherwood, *Ohio* .....D
Sims, *Tenn.* .....D
Sinnott, *Oreg.* .....R
Slemp, *Va.* .....R
Smith, *Idaho* .....R
Smith, *Maryland* .....D
Smith, J. M. C., *Mich.* .....R
Smith, S. W., *Mich.* .....R
Smith, *Minn.* .....R
Smith, *N. Y.* .....D
Steenerson, *Minn.* .....R
Stephens, *Calif.* .....PR
Stevens, *N. H.* .....D
Stone, *Ill.* .....D
Stout, *Mont.* .....D
Stringer, *Ill.* .....D
Sutherland, *W. Va.* .....R
Taggart, *Kans.* .....D
Tavenner, *Ill.* .....D
Taylor, *Colo.* .....D
Taylor, *N. Y.* .....D
Temple, *Pa.* .....P
Thompson, *Okla.* .....D
Thomson, *Ill.* .....P
Towner, *Iowa* .....R
Treadway, *Mass.* .....R
Vare, *Pa.* .....R
Volstead, *Minn.* .....R
Walters, *Pa.* .....P
Williams, *Ill.* .....D
Woods, *Iowa* .....R
Young, *N. Dak.* .....R

Nays—204.

Abercrombie, Ala. D	Cantor, *N. Y.*.....D	Fields, *Ky.* .....D	Henry, *Texas* .....D	Moon, *Tenn.* .....D	Stedman, *N. C.*.....D
Adamson, *Ga.* .....D	Cantrill, *Ky.* .....D	Finley, *S. C.*.....D	Hinds, *Me.* .....R	Moore, *Pa.* .....R	Stephens, *Miss.* .....D
Aiken, *S. C.*.....D	Caraway, *Ark.* .....D	Fitzgerald, *N. Y.*.....D	Holland, *Va.* .....D	Morgan, *La.* .....D	Stephens, *Nebr.* .....D
Ashbrook, *Ohio* .....D	Carew, *N. Y.*.....D	Flood, *Va.* .....D	Houston, *Tenn.* .....D	Morrison, *Ind.* .....D	Stephens, *Texas* .....D
Aswell, *La.* .....D	Carlin, *Va.* .....D	Floyd, *Ark.* .....D	Howard, *Ga.* .....D	Mulkey, *Ala.* .....D	Stevens, *Minn.* .....R
Bailey, *Pa.* .....D	Carter, *Okla.* .....D	Gard, *Ohio* .....D	Hughes, *Ga.* .....D	Murray, *Okla.* .....D	Sumners, *Texas* .....D
Baltz, *Ill.* .....D	Cary, *Wis.* .....R	Gardner, *Mass.* .....R	Hull, *Tenn.* .....D	Oldfield, *Ark.* .....D	Switzer, *Ohio* .....R
Barchfeld, *Pa.* .....R	Clark, *Fla.* .....D	Garner, *Texas* .....D	Humphreys, *Miss.*.....D	Page, *N. C.*.....D	Talbott, *Md.* .....D
Barkley, *Ky.* .....D	Coady, *Md.* .....D	Garrett, *Tenn.* .....D	Jacoway, *Ark.* .....D	Paige, *Mass.* .....R	Talcott, *N. Y.*.....D
Bartholdt, *Mo.* .....R	Collier, *Miss.* .....D	Garrett, *Texas* .....D	Johnson, *Ky.* .....D	Park, *Ga.* .....D	Taylor, *Ala.* .....D
Bartlett, *Ga.* .....D	Connolly, *Iowa* .....D	Gerry, *R. I.*.....D	Johnson, *S. C.*.....D	Parker, *N. J.* .....R	Taylor, *Ark.* .....D
Beakes, *Mich.* .....D	Conry, *N. Y.*.....D	Gill, *Mo.* .....D	Kennedy, *Conn.* .....D	Parker, *N. Y.*.....R	Thacher, *Mass.* .....D
Beall, *Texas* .....D	Cooper, *Wis.* .....R	Gillett, *Mass.* .....R	Key, *Ohio* .....D	Patten, *N. Y.*.....D	Thomas, *Ky.* .....D
Blackmon, *Ala.* .....D	Cox, *Ind.* .....D	Gittins, *N. Y.*.....D	Kindel, *Colo.* .....D	Platt, *N. Y.*.....R	Tribble, *Ga.* .....D
Booher, *Mo.* .....D	Crisp, *Ga.* .....D	Glass, *Va.* .....D	Kitchin, *N. C.*.....D	Plumley, *Vt.* .....R	Tuttle, *N. J.*.....D
Bowdle, *Ohio* .....D	Cullop, *Ind.* .....D	Godwin, *N. C.*.....D	Konop, *Wis.* .....D	Post, *Ohio* .....D	Underhill, *N. Y.*.....D
Brockson *Del.* .....D	Danforth, *N. Y.*.....R	Goeke, *Ohio* .....D	Korbly, *Ind.* .....D	Pou, *N. C.*.....D	Underwood, *Ala.* .....D
Broussard, *La.* .....D	Davis, *Minn.* .....R	Goodwin, *Ark.* .....D	Langham, *Pa.* .....R	Price, *Md.* .....D	Vaughan, *Texas* .....D
Brown, *W. Va.*.....D	Dent, *Ala.* .....D	Gordon, *Ohio* .....D	Lazaro, *La.* .....D	Quin, *Miss.* .....D	Vinson, *Ga.* .....D
Browne, *Wis.* .....R	Dies, *Texas* .....D	Goulden, *N. Y.*.....D	Lee, *Ga.* .....D	Ragsdale, *S. C.*.....D	Vollmer, *Iowa* .....D
Browning, *N. J.*.....R	Difenderfer, *Pa.* .....D	Graham, *Ill.* .....D	Lee, *Pa.* .....D	Rauch, *Ind.* .....D	Walker, *Ga.* .....D
Brumbaugh, *Ohio* ....D	Dixon, *Ind.* .....D	Gray, *Ind.* .....D	Lenroot, *Wis.* .....R	Rayburn, *Texas* .....D	Wallin, *N. Y.*.....R
Buchanan, *Texas* ....D	Donohoe, *Pa.* .....D	Greene, *Mass.* .....R	Lesher, *Pa.* .....D	Reed, *N. H.*.....D	Walsh, *N. J.*.....D
Bulkley, *Ohio* .....D	Donovan, *Conn.* .....D	Greene, *Vt.* .....R	Lever, *S. C.*.....D	Reilly, *Wis.* .....D	Watkins, *La.* .....D
Burgess, *Texas* .....D	Dooling, *N. Y.*.....D	Gregg, *Texas* .....D	Lewis, *Md.* .....D	Riordan, *N. Y.*.....D	Watson, *Va.* .....D
Burke, *Pa.* .....R	Doremus, *Mich.* .....D	Griffin, *N. Y.*.....D	Lieb, *Ind.* .....D	Rouse, *Ky.* .....D	Weaver, *Okla.* .....D
Burke, *S. Dak.*.....R	Doughton, *N. C.*.....D	Gudger, *N. C.*.....D	Linthicum, *Md.* .....D	Sherley, *Ky.* .....D	Webb, *N. C.*.....D
Burke, *Wis.* .....D	Driscoll, *N. Y.*.....D	Hamilton, *N. Y.*.....R	Lobeck, *Nebr.* .....D	Sisson, *Miss.* .....D	Whaley, *S. C.*.....D
Burnett, *Ala.* .....D	Dupre, *La.* .....D	Hardy, *Texas* .....D	Lonergan, *Conn.* .....D	Slayden, *Texas* .....D	Whitacre, *Ohio* .....D
Byrnes, *S. C.*.....D	Eagle, *Texas* .....D	Harris, *Ala.* .....D	McGillicuddy, *Me.*.....D	Sloan, *Nebr.* .....R	White, *Ohio* .....D
Byrns, *Tenn.* .....D	Edwards, *Ga.* .....D	Harrison, *Miss.* .....D	Maguire, *Nebr.* .....D	Small, *N. C.*.....D	Wingo, *Ark.* .....D
Calder, *N. Y.*.....R	Esch, *Wis.* .....R	Hay, *Va.* .....D	Mahan, *Conn.* .....D	Smith, *Texas* .....D	Winslow, *Mass.* .....R
Callaway, *Texas* .....D	Estopinal, *La.* .....D	Heflin, *Ala.* .....D	Miller, *Minn.* .....R	Sparkman, *Fla.* .....D	Witherspoon, *Miss.*....D
Candler, *Miss.* .....D	Fairchild, *N. Y.*.....R	Helm, *Ky.* .....D	Montague, *Va.* .....D	Stafford, *Wis.* .....R	Young, *Texas* .....D

Not Voting—46.

Ainey, *Pa.* .....R	Dunn, *N. Y.*.....R	Johnson, *Utah* .....R	Lindquist, *Mich.* .....R	Padgett, *Tenn.* .....D	Shreve, *Pa.* .....R
Allen, *Ohio* .....D	Elder, *La.* .....D	Jones, *Va.* .....D	Loft, *N. Y.*.....D	Peters, *Mass.* .....D	Stanley, *Ky.* .....D
Barton, *Nebr.* .....R	Faison, *N. C.*.....D	Kennedy, *Iowa* .....R	McClellan, *N. Y.*.....D	Powers, *Ky.* .....R	Ten Eyck, *N. Y.*.....D
Bell, *Ga.* .....D	Falconer, *Wash.* .....P	Kennedy, *R. I.*.....R	Manahan, *Minn.* .....R	Roberts, *Nev.* .....R	Townsend, *N. J.*.....D
Brodbeck, *Pa.* .....D	Goldfogle, *N. Y.*.....D	Kreider, *Pa.* .....R	Morin, *Pa.* .....R	Rothermel, *Pa.* .....D	Wilson, *Fla.* .....D
Bruckner, *N. Y.*.....D	Hinebaugh, *Ill.* .....P	L'Engle, *Fla.* .....D	Moss, *W. Va.* .....R	Saunders, *Va.* .....D	Wilson, *N. Y.*.....D
Claypool, *Ohio* .....D	Hoxworth, *Ill.* .....D	Levy, *N. Y.*.....D	O'Brien, *N. Y.*.....D	Scott, *Iowa* .....R	Woodruff, *Mich.* .....P
Dale, *N. Y.*.....D	Igoe, *Mo.* .....D	Lewis, *Pa.* .....P	Oglesby, *N. Y.*.....D		

PAIRS

Mr. Roberts of Nevada, Republican, and Mr. Moss of West Virginia, Republican (in favor of suffrage amendment) with Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Republican (against).

Mr. Hoxworth of Illinois, Democrat, and Mr. Johnson, Republican, of Utah (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. Igoe of Missouri, Democrat (against).

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan, Progressive, and Mr. Falconer of Washington, Progressive (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. Wilson of Florida, Democrat (against).

Mr. Shreve of Pennsylvania, Republican, and Mr. Dunn of New York, Republican (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. Saunders of Virginia, Democrat (against).

Mr. Peters of Maine, Republican, and Mr. Levy of New York, Democrat (for suffrage amendment) with Mr. Bell of Georgia, Democrat (against).

Mr. Townsend of New Jersey, Democrat, and Mr. Hinebaugh of Illinois, Progressive (for Mondell amendment) with Mr. Morin of Pennsylvania, Republican (against).

AN ENGLISH COMPARISON

By F. W. Pethick-Lawrence

I HAVE listened to many suffrage debates in the British House of Commons and marked a steadily improving tone in each succeeding year. Now that for the first time I have heard the subject discussed in the American House of Representatives, I have been interested to make a comparison and a contrast.

First, with regard to the spectators in the galleries. I found little or nothing of the English formality—no division of the sexes into watertight compartments; no grille for the ladies, no rigid rules against making notes—and even applause, though forbidden, seemed scarcely regarded as the same heinous, almost blasphemous offence that it is in my own country.

There was also much less formality on the floor of the House. I was much attracted by the method of allotting short sections of time to a large number of speakers, thereby encouraging brevity and concentrated argument. In England everything is in favor of lengthy speeches—not only is a short speech frequently ignored in the press, but length is cultivated as a deliberate political weapon. On the other hand, our speeches are, it seems to me, rather more carefully thought out and chosen especially for their appeal to a deliberative assembly, while many of those that I heard in the American chamber were rhetorical and of the same character as would be made from an ordinary public platform at a mass meeting.

But differences of manner and method are after all only skin-deep. The really interesting comparison relates to the matter of the speeches and the ideas which underlie them. I went to the House anxious to find out whether American men were more progressive than Englishmen in their views with regard to women; I came away satisfied that there were more extremes of opinion. On the one hand, I heard speeches which carried me back to the debates of many years ago in the House of Commons. There was the same talk about "fascinating ladies," the "Queens of the Home," the "caressing and guarding angels," the "protecting arm of man," the fear lest woman's purity should be "soiled by the corrupting influence of politics," and even the "hand that rocks the cradle." These old stage properties of the nineteenth century-anti-suffragists were trotted out with the most extraordinary solemnity and even applauded as if they were wonderful inspirations of the speakers of today.

On the other hand, there was the unanswerable logic of the men who came from the suffrage states and who struck a note of assurance which is always lacking in our English House. "It is not merely what we think," said one of them, "it is what we know." Piece by piece they showed up the arguments of their opponents as a disingenuous sham. They challenged them to prove that the women in the enfranchised states were less careful of their homes, less loving as mothers, less pure and clean in their outlook, less essentially "women" in all that is best in the word in consequence of having secured the power to care for the children of the race in the bigger world which lies outside the home. And this challenge was not taken up because it could not be.

This is the great advantage which the women of America have over the women of England. The fact that equal suffrage not only exists but has been proved a sucess in so large a part of the country is an argument against which the united opposition of timidity, prejudice and vested interest cannot hope much longer to prevail.

Over Half of the People in Washington
EAT CORBY'S BREAD--WHY?

Analysis by States of the Vote in the House

ANALYZING the House vote by states, two important facts stand out very plainly.

The first is that the solid South is not by any means solid, as has been so often alleged, in opposition to the National Suffrage Amendment.

Of the 174 votes cast in favor of the suffrage amendment in the House of Representatives, 23 came from Southern states: Alabama, 1; Kentucky, 1; Maryland, 1; Missouri, 11; Tennessee, 4; Virginia, 1; and West Virginia, 4.

The second fact which stands out clearly in this analysis is that the greatest strength of the favorable vote came from the non-suffrage states. Many times has it been contended that it is impossible for a federal amendment to carry until more states have been won for suffrage. The fact that considerably more than half the total favorable vote came from non-suffrage states seems to indicate that there is sufficient suffrage sentiment in the non-suffrage states to make possible the passage of the National Amendment without the winning of any more state referendums.

Of the total favorable vote from the non-suffrage states, counting Illinois in connection with this fact as a non-suffrage state, 138 votes or 79 per cent of the total favorable vote came from non-suffrage states. (Although women have a large measure of suffrage in Illinois they do not vote for Members of Congress and therefore cannot hold their Congressmen responsible, at the polls, for their vote on this measure. It is therefore proper, in this analysis, to regard Illinois as a non-suffrage state.)

The total possible vote from the eleven states where women are fully enfranchised is 40. Only 1 of these votes was cast against the measure, while 3 others from these states were absent but paired in favor of the bill. The fully enfranchised states cast therefore but 21 per cent of the total favorable vote.

If Illinois, because of the large amount of political power which the women possess, should be classed with the enfranchised states we would find that 116 votes on the affirmative side would be considered as from non-suffrage states and 58 from suffrage states, with but 3 votes in opposition (1 from Colorado and 2 from Illinois), 5 not voting (but all paired in favor of the amendment) and 1 vacancy. The percentages would then be: 66 per cent of the favorable vote from non-suffrage states and 34 per cent from suffrage states.

The figures by states are given below.

Alabama
Aye..... 1 *D*
No..... 9 *D*

Arizona
Aye..... 1 *D*

Arkansas
Aye..... None
No..... 7 *D*

California
Aye.....11
(6 R, 3 D, 1 P, 1 Ind.)

Colorado
Aye..... 3 *D*
No..... 1 *D*

Connecticut
Aye..... 1 *D*
No..... 4 *D*

Delaware
Aye..... None
No..... 1 *D*

Florida
Aye..... None
No..... 2 *D*
(2 not voting)

Georgia
Aye..... None
No.....11 *D*
(1 not voting)

Idaho
Aye..... 2 *R*
No..... None

Illinois
Aye.....22
(16 D, 5 R, 1 P)
No..... 2 *D*
(2 not voting)

Indiana
Aye..... 5 *D*
No..... 8 *D*

Iowa
Aye..... 7
(6 R, 1 D)
No..... 2 *D*
(2 not voting)

Kansas
Aye..... 8
(6 R, 5 D, 1 P)
No..... None

Kentucky
Aye..... 1 *R*
No..... 8 *D*
(2 not voting)

Louisiana
Aye..... None
No..... 7 *D*
(1 not voting)

Maine
Aye..... 1 *R*
No..... 2
(1 D, 1 R)
(1 not voting)

Maryland
Aye..... 1 *D*
No..... 5 *D*

Massachusetts
Aye..... 8
(5 D, 3 R)
No..... 6
(5 R, 1 D)

Michigan
Aye..... 9
(8 R, 1 P)
No..... 2 *D*
(1 not voting)

Minnesota
Aye..... 5 *R*
No..... 3 *R*
(1 not voting)

Mississippi
Aye..... None
No..... 8 *D*

Missouri
Aye.....11 *D*
No..... 3
(1 R, 2 D)
(1 not voting)

Montana
Aye..... 2 *D*

Nebraska
Aye..... 1 *R*
No..... 4
(3 D, 1 R)
(1 not voting)

Nevada
Aye..... None
No..... None
(1 not voting)

New Hampshire
Aye..... 1 *D*
No..... 1 *D*

New Jersey
Aye..... 7
(6 D, 1 R)
No..... 4
(3 D, 1 R)
(1 not voting)

New Mexico
Aye..... 1 *D*

New York
Aye..... 9
(7 D, 1 R, 1 P)
No.....20
(13 D, 7 R)
(12 not voting)

North Carolina
Aye..... None
No..... 9 *D*
(1 not voting)

North Dakota
Aye..... 3 *R*

Ohio
Aye..... 5
(1 R, 4 D)
No.....12
(1 R, 11 D)
(2 not voting)

Oklahoma
Aye..... 5
(2 R, 3 D)
No..... 3 *D*

Oregon
Aye..... 3 *R*

Pennsylvania
Aye.....20
(10 R, 5 D, 5 P)
No..... 9
(6 D, 3 R)
(7 not voting)

Rhode Island
Aye..... 1 *D*
No..... 1 *D*
(1 not voting)

South Carolina
Aye..... None
No..... 7 *D*

South Dakota
Aye..... 2 *R*
No..... 1 *R*

Tennessee
Aye..... 4
(2 D, 2 R)
No..... 5 *D*

Texas
Aye..... None
No.....18 *D*

Utah
Aye..... 1 *R*
No..... None
(1 not voting)

Vermont
Aye..... None
No..... 2 *R*

Virginia
Aye..... 1 *R*
No..... 7 *D*
(2 not voting)

Washington
Aye..... 4
(1 P, 3 R)
No..... None
(1 not voting)

West Virginia
Aye..... 4
(1 D, 3 R)
No..... 1 *D*
(1 not voting)

Wisconsin
Aye..... 2 *R*
No..... 9
(6 R, 3 D)

Wyoming
Aye..... 1 *R*
No..... None

THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY

By Annie G. Porritt

THE most outstanding feature of the work of the Congressional Union is the quality of the women that it has drawn to its support. This was particularly noticeable last Sunday when the Union celebrated the second anniversary of the starting of practical political work at the national capital. The day's proceedings began with a luncheon for the members of the Advisory Council at the home of Mrs. William Kent, wife of Representative Kent of California, and a member of the Executive Committee of the Union. Besides Mrs. Kent, the Women Voters were represented by Dr. Cora Smith King, Treasurer of the National Council of Women Voters. Among the other guests at the luncheon, which was given in the large room overlooking Mrs. Kent's beautiful garden, were Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, President of the Political Equality League of New York, and also a member of the Executive Committee of the Union; Mrs. Harriott Stanton Blatch, with her keen political acumen, her wonderful gift of speech and her graciousness of manner and bearing; Miss Julia Hurlbut, Vice President of the Women's Political Union of New Jersey; Mrs. Charles V. Meredith, Vice President of the Virginia Suffrage League; Mrs. Glendower Evans, famed as the only woman member of the Minimum Wage Commission of Massachusetts; Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman; Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles of Delaware; Mrs. Gilson Gardner, wife of the eminent newspaper correspondent; Mrs. George H. Day of Hartford, Connecticut, and Miss Elsie Hill, daughter of Representative Hill of Connecticut.

In Executive Session after the luncheon, plans for the work of the coming year were discussed.

The evening meeting was an entire success. The ball room at Rauscher's was crowded some little time before the meeting was opened, and members and friends of the Union were standing at the rear of the room, in the anti-room and corridor.

Seated on the platform with Miss Alice Paul, Chairman of the Union, were Representative Frank W. Mondell of Wyoming, Mrs. Harriott Stanton Blatch, Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Mrs. William Kent, and Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence. Mr. Mondell spoke of the coming vote in the House of Representatives—the first vote ever taken on a national suffrage amendment in the House. Mr. Mondell concluded with most optimistic predictions of the success at a very early date of the national amendment. He was followed by Mrs. Blatch, who gave an historical glimpse of the national work, telling of the labors which her mother had expended on behalf of the federal amendment in the days when the bill was first introduced in Congress.

After outlining the tentative plans for the coming year's work, Miss Paul appealed for funds and over $8,000 was promptly pledged for the 1915 campaign. Mrs. Kent then asked for members to join her Finance Committee of one hundred, and many in the audience responded at once to her appeal.

The evening concluded with stirring speeches by Mrs. Gilman and Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence, emphasizing the significance of the coming vote in the House, and the unity of all Suffragists in supporting the pending amendment.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS

Excuse Him; He's Tied

FOR the eighth time, President Wilson has turned back a delegation of representative women who approached him in the cause of equal suffrage. 'I am tied," he says, "to a conviction which I have had all my life, that changes of this sort ought to be brought about state by state."

It is difficult to see how a man like Woodrow Wilson can be worked around to a conviction that an issue like political freedom, an issue between God and man, not between Dakota and Florida, or New York and Arizona, should be left to communities.

Why was not the freedom of the negro left to the states?

Why not leave the tariff question to the states?

Why not leave the prohibition issue to the states?

Why not leave matters of transportation rates to the states?

Why not condemn Abraham Lincoln for his emancipation declaration because South Carolina didn't like it?

The answer is that the good of all, the good of the Union is paramount to the desires of any state, or combination of states. Lincoln's belief that this nation cannot endure half-slave and half-free holds as strongly today as it did fifty years ago.

And how must we rank a big, brainy man who at 57 years of age finds himself "tied" by a conviction he's had all his life? The cemeteries show the names of many a great man who was so "tied" by his conviction of states' rights that he failed to come within a mile of his great opportunities and great possibilities.

Ninety-nine per cent of the world was convinced all their lives that Galileo was an idiot, and yet he was only founding the system of our physics and astronomy. What of the world of today had Newton, Darwin, Pasteur, Edison, Marconi, Wright and a score of other rebels against being "tied" remained tied to the prevailing convictions? Is any man wise or safe who is "tied" by a conviction on anything for 57 years?

We have men who always vote the straight ticket just because their grandfathers did. There are people who dread to ride on electric street cars because they always had safe rides on horse cars. Convictions are like clothes; they wear out, in time become rags. The great law of nature is change, and mighty few are the convictions to which an intelligent man of 57 years can honestly believe he is tied and always has been.

The truly great men, whose names and deeds will long endure, became great by overturning convictions that "tied." The great opportunity came and the great men seized upon it. The divine right, Freedom, called; and there was Washington. The divine right, Freedom, called again; and there was Lincoln. Again Freedom calls; and there is Wilson, but he's "tied."—*San Diego Sun.*

The President's Reply

PRESIDENT WILSON had a good time with the 100 Suffragists who called upon him, but when the ladies took an invoice of stock they realized that the President had not said much.—*Daily Argus-Leader,* Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Jan. 8.

The Twentieth Century

REPRESENTATIVE ADAMSON decorates the House and also the state of Georgia. In that diverse and thrilling jewel the *Congressional Record,* on page 397, is discovered a wild alluring flight of genius in which Mr. Adamson says:

"If ladies are ever to descend from their high estate of supremacy as lovely charmers and ministering angels of mankind down to the common level of mere men politicians * * * it should not be done by clamor and parade and in unladylike demonstrations and exhibitions."

If the "ladies" ask the vote in any locality "not many suns would set and rise until the fair creatures had been clothed with all the rights of political degradation with the same option that men now have to claim the privilege—but shirk the duty."

It sounds impossible, do you say, that a man in this day could use these words and think he was making suffrage and not himself look ridiculous?

If you say that, you do not know the *Congressional Record;* and if you do not follow that incomparable serial you do not get the choicest flights of human kind.—*Harper's Weekly,* January 9, 1915.

Woman Suffrage before Congress

THE Suffragists know that, so far as the present House is concerned, the Republicans approve of a constitutional amendment and the Democrats do not. But no less than 86 Democrats voted for the Mondell resolution. In the Sixty-fourth Congress there will not be so many Democrats and there will be many more Republicans than sit in the present House. The Democratic majority will be reduced from 167 to 38. So close will be the margin in the Sixty-fourth Congress that the minority, led by Mr. Mann of Illinois, who is now a full-blown Suffragist, will be disposed to regard such a resolution as Mr. Mondell's with peculiar favor. The vote taken on Tuesday has no relation to an election for members of Congress; perhaps if an election had been impending the score for a constitutional amendment would be higher, but apparently not high enough to assure the two-thirds vote required. In the next House, and with a national election to come, the result might be more favorable to the Suffragists. Whether the Senate, where the Democratic majority is to be materially increased, would give them any more cause for encouragement may be doubted. It would depend in a measure upon the vote recorded in the House. There would certainly be no hope for the Suffragists in the Senate if they could not secure a two-thirds vote in the popular body.—*The New York Sun,* January 14.

The Suffrage Vote

THE vote on the Mondell Amendment to enfranchise women was, from the standpoint of reasonable expectation, a triumph for the advocates of woman suffrage. That the question in a most radical form and upon its first hearing before the whole House should receive 174 votes to 204 against it indicates the force developed by the "cause" throughout the country.

To what exact extent the vote shows the strength of woman suffrage in Congress it is less easy to say. If the zeal of some Illinois representatives, who voted yea has its source in a discreet sense of the direct "influence" of Illinois women since their partial enfranchisement rather than in independent conviction, it is none the less dependable. Perhaps a few of the 174 voted yea for policy's sake and would have voted nay if the amendment had had a better chance of winning. A "practical" man, realizing that his security might be endangered by the acquisition of the franchise, might deem it worth his while to acquire a little merit if it were not too hazardous.

But such Machiavellians must be very few, if, indeed, there are any, while on the other hand a number of pro-suffrage votes must have been denied the Mondell amendment because of a conscientious belief that enfranchisement should come state by state.

It may be many years before some states grant the franchise to their women citizens, but it certainly appears that the movement has the force of American social and political tendency behind it.—*Chicago Tribune,* January 14.

New Members

AMONG the new members who have recently joined the Congressional Union are Miss Sara Moore, a prominent young newspaper writer and cartoonist of Detroit, Michigan, who was sent by the *Detroit News* to write up the suffrage movement in England; Mrs. Carolina Elizabeth Harrell, and Lucille Wetherill, of Mexico; Miss Louise Connelly, educational expert in the free Public Library, of Newark, N. J.; Mrs. Minerva Dent Taylor, of Decatur, Illinois, wife of the founder and President Emeritus of Milliken College; Miss Evelina Belden, of Oberlin, Ohio, research expert in the Children's Bureau; Mrs. Alice Durand Edgerton, formerly teacher of English in Oberlin College, and Miss Mary McDowell, head of the University Settlement of Chicago.

Direct Advertising

—is the thing. Get close to your prospect through the mail. Try this modern method of "business getting" today. We specialize in Mail Order Printing

COLUMBIAN PRINTING CO., Inc.
815 Fourteenth St. N. W.

Telephone Main 673

Lanman Engraving Co.

HALF TONES, ZINC ETCHINGS
PROCESS ENGRAVERS

POST BUILDING Washington, D. C.

Meyer's Military Shops
1327 F STREET NORTHWEST
Laces, Braids, Fringes, Cords, Gold, Antique Silver
We WILL Match YOUR MATERIAL
"Visit Our Show Shop"

Phone Main 8384 Toilet Articles

GERTRUDE CLEMENS
Expert Shampooing and Hairdressing
Room 232 Oxford Building, 726 14th Street N.W.
Manicuring—Hair Work Facial and Scalp Treatment
Open Evenings Until Seven

"THE BUSY CORNER"
S. Kann Sons & Co.
8TH ST. AND PENNA. AVE.

OPEN 9:00 A. M.—CLOSE 5:45 P. M.

JET! JET! JET!
YET AGAIN
Gleaming and Fascinating
DRESS TRIMMINGS

It has a wonderful vogue—the use of sparkling jet ornaments and garnitures. There are many new things including:

Ornaments, Tassels, Festoon Effects, Pendants, Chain Effects, Cascade Effects, Spangles, Cabochons, Sequins Garnitures

The designs are quite new and mostly to be found ONLY at KANNS'.

Prices range from 15c a yard to $5.95 for the all-overs and flouncings. Tassels from 10c to $1.69 each.

Trimming Store—Street Floor